	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/005,182	COHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _Non-Final_

(1) _Boris Pesin_.

(3) _____ .

(2) _James Schutz_.

(4) _____ .

Date of Interview: _21 September 2005_

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
_NA_

Claims discussed:
Claim 3

Prior art documents discussed:
_NA_

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____	_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner believes that the limitation "wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence" is not supported by the specification. The Examiner phoned the Attorney of record for clarification in this matter. The Attorney explained that he felt that the limitation is supported by the specification, in particular on Page 7. He specifically pointed out from the passage, "For instance, a task could be defined as completing steps one through four. The user could then inquire as to how frequently this task is completed or the typical manner in which the task is or is not completed." The Attorney acknowledged if the task was not completed that it was inherent that user must have accessed an object that is not in the task sequence.